

**REMARKS**

**Amendments to the specification**

The informality in the specification has been corrected as detailed hereinabove, based on the passage of the specification on page 10, lines 10 and 11.

**Response to claim rejections — 35 USC §112**

Claims 31 and 46 have been amended as detailed hereinabove. The support for said amendment can be found at least at page 6 lines 7 to 10 of the specification, where it is stated that the orifice of the base allows the product to pass from the reservoir to the backing, and page 6 lines 24-27, where it is stated that each of the different elements of the device is provided with at least one orifice allowing the product to pass from the reservoir to the application head.

All the objections raised by the examiner have been addressed, and it is submitted that the claims thus do not contravene 35 USC §112.

**Response to claim rejections — 35 USC §103**

The Examiner maintains his rejections based on 35 USC §103.

The Examiner combines Bauman et al. and Gueret (point 7), as well as Baumann et al., Gueret and a further reference (points 8-11).

**Claims 19-23, 29, 31-39, 41, 42, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Baumann et al. in view of Gueret.**

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that it is not possible that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the teachings of Baumann et al. with those of Gueret.

As already discussed, Baumann et al. describe a device for storing and applying a mass which may be a shaving cream, said device being provided with an

application head which can be a brush. As stated by the Examiner himself in the present Office Action, Baumann et al. do not specify the length of the bristles of the brush.

There is no reason to combine Baumann et al. with Gueret. Gueret does not relate to the same field of endeavor as Baumann et al. In fact, Gueret teaches an application for applying a liquid make-up product, such as nail polish.

In addition to the fact that the domain is completely different, the device of Gueret has properties which are also completely different from those sought for in Baumann et al. Indeed, the application of Gueret allows make-up to be applied rapidly while at the same time conveying much more product than a conventional brush (see column 1, lines 43-46 of Gueret).

So not only is the reference not part of the same field, but additionally it is not even reasonably relevant to the particular problem with which the inventors were involved.

These two documents thus cannot be combined to object to the unobviousness.

**Goncalves, Barber, Jr., Donsky and Webster**

Each one of the following four documents are cited in combination with Baumann et al. in view of Gueret, in relation to certain dependant claims.

We have already argued and maintain that Baumann et al. and Gueret cannot be combined, as they relate to different fields of endeavor, and to different problems.

The other cited documents should also not be taken into account for the following reasons:

**Goncalves:**

Goncalves teaches a container for the controlled release of product, preferably a detergent, (column 1, line 41), which can be made of flexible plastic material (column 2, lines 8-10).

Again the field is different, and the inventors were involved with a different problem.

Barber, Jr.

Barber Jr. teaches an abrasive brush with suitable durability and abrading characteristics.

It is absolutely clear that this document relates to a completely different domain, and to problems completely different from that faced by the inventors: an abrasive brush would have an effect dramatically different from that of the device of applying a shaving product.

Donsky

As Gueret, Donsky teaches a nail polish applicator system, and as Gueret, it relates to a completely different field and different issues.

Webster

This document teaches a dispensing package for isolating one or more ingredients prior to dispersing, in particular a cosmetic composition.

The cited documents, and in particular Baumann et al. and Gueret, cannot be combined as they relate to different fields of endeavor and also they are not all reasonably relevant to the particular issues with which the inventor was involved.

The instant claims are thus unobvious in view of the cited prior art, and thus do not contravene 35 USC § 103. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions, she is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned.

Dated: June 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas A. Miller

Registration No.: 40,091

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive

6300 Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant